
CAPTURING THE FLEET'S POLICY FOR WEIGHTING THE IMPORTANCE OF THE NAVY'S ADVANCEMENT DECISIONS

Technical Report No. 548

Prepared by:

Jerry W. Hedge, Walter C. Borman, Ulf C. Kubisiak, and
Mark J. Bourne

September 2006

Personnel Decisions Research Institutes

a PREVISOR™ company

100 South Ashley Drive, Suite 375
Tampa, FL 33602

Report Documentation Page				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.					
1. REPORT DATE SEP 2006		2. REPORT TYPE		3. DATES COVERED 00-00-2006 to 00-00-2006	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Capturing the Fleet's Policy for Weighting the Importance of the Navy's Advancement Decisions				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S)				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Personnel Decisions Research Institutes, 100 South Ashley Drive, Suite 375, Tampa, FL, 33602				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for public release; distribution unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT Same as Report (SAR)	18. NUMBER OF PAGES 24	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT unclassified	b. ABSTRACT unclassified	c. THIS PAGE unclassified			

Executive Summary

Background

Over the last several years the Navy has invested considerable time and energy in developing a human resource strategy that emphasizes the link between personnel quality and operational readiness. Success will require the linkage of human resource approaches with the accomplishment of organizational goals; implementation of recruiting, selection, training, and retention approaches that foster mission accomplishment; and transformation to a results-oriented organizational culture.

One human resource component that will play a vital role is personnel advancement. The process of identifying potential candidates for advancement, and selecting those to be promoted is critical for an organization's continuing success and productivity. Organizations use a variety of different personnel advancement systems to facilitate the decision-making process, and many of these systems incorporate multiple criteria to improve accurate evaluation of candidates.

For Navy Enlisted Sailors, the current advancement system provides for the orderly progression of qualified personnel to higher levels of responsibility throughout their naval careers. Generally, advancement is based on demonstrated proficiency in assigned duties, on the performance evaluation and recommendation of the commanding officer, and on written examinations.

Approach

While the current advancement system is operating adequately, it is prudent to speculate on how Navy Enlisted advancement might operate within a Five Vector Model (5VM) perspective. It is possible to envision development of an *advancement algorithm* that links performance across all five vectors to advancement to the next paygrade. The notion is that an advancement score could be computed based on achievement of defined milestones across all vectors, as part of the broader plan to define the career paths associated with a member's professional development, personal development, leadership abilities, certifications and qualifications, and overall performance.

The first step in developing such a system would be to establish a scientifically sound approach for weighting the contribution of each of the five vectors in making advancement decisions. In 2003 we conducted a research study with that

objective in mind. This feasibility study used a *policy capturing* methodology to assist the judgmental processes related to advancement decisions.

The feasibility study involved conducting workshops where participants were presented with 5VM profiles, with preset "scores" on the different vectors and asked to rate the promotability of each "profiled Sailor." Analyses of data from these workshops essentially determined the relative weight of each vector in the advancement algorithm. These relative weights were generated for advancement to apprentice, journeyman, and master skill levels.

While the feasibility study established that a policy capturing methodology provides a scientifically sound procedure for determining 5VM advancement weights, it emphasized a long-range perspective, where vectors were defined based on an anticipated, fully developed 5VM. The purpose of the current study was to apply a more specific, near-term focus, where definitions of the five vectors reflected currently available quantitative advancement data organized within a 5VM framework.

Once again, we applied a policy capturing methodology to determine vector weights across the three skill levels. In all, 24 workshops were conducted in Bremerton, WA, Millington, TN, Norfolk, VA, and Pensacola, FL, to capture the vector priorities of the 347 participants.

Results and Discussion

The basic finding was that job performance is overall the most important factor, but as skill level progresses, leadership becomes increasingly important, to a point where performance and leadership are roughly equally important. Professional development is also an important factor, especially early in a Navy career, and, certifications/qualifications have some importance at the lower and middle advancement levels. Finally, personal development was afforded lesser importance for the advancement of Enlisted personnel.

The policy capturing research described here provided a scientifically sound approach for pooling the judgment and wisdom of experienced Enlisted personnel regarding the relative weights that should be placed on each of the 5VM vectors in making advancement decisions. This study provided a way for the Fleet to collectively provide their judgment about advancement policy in the U.S. Navy.

Table of Contents

Introduction	1
Five Vector Model.....	1
Navy Advancement.....	1
5VM Advancement.....	2
Study 1: 2003.....	3
Objectives of Study 2	4
Methodology for Study 2: 2006.....	7
Overview	7
Procedure	7
Data Collection	9
Analyses	11
Results.....	13
Discussion	15
References	17

List of Tables

Table 1. Vector Definitions	2
Table 2. Relative Weights for Enlisted Personnel Advancement	4
Table 3. Vector Definitions	9
Table 4. Demographics for Enlisted Level Workshops	10
Table 5. Relative Weights for Enlisted Personnel Advancement	13
Table 6. Study 1 and Study 2 Relative Weights for Enlisted Personnel Advancement	14

Introduction

Over the last several years the Navy has invested considerable time and energy in developing a human resource strategy that emphasizes the link between personnel quality and operational readiness. Certainly, a key factor in the success of the Navy's human resource management strategy is the sustained attention of its senior leaders. Most recently, this 'commitment to its people' from Navy leadership was underscored by release of ADM Mullen's CNO Guidance for 2006, which called for building upon this strategy, to "deliver a transformed, competency-focused manpower and personnel system for all segments of our workforce" (p. 7; Mullen, 2006). Success will require the linkage of human resource approaches with the accomplishment of organizational goals; implementation of recruiting, selection, training, and retention approaches that foster mission accomplishment; and transformation to a results-oriented organizational culture.

Five Vector Model

Many of these human resource initiatives view a Sailor's career as comprised of five distinct areas or "vectors." These vectors include: professional development, personal development, leadership, certifications and qualifications, and job performance. This five vector model (5VM) forms the foundation around which the Navy identifies the knowledge, skills, and abilities that Sailors need to succeed in today's Navy. A description of how this 5VM is conceptualized can be found in Table 1.

Navy Advancement

One human resource component that will play a vital role is personnel advancement. The process of identifying potential candidates for advancement, and selecting those to be promoted is critical for an organization's continuing success and productivity. Organizations use a variety of different personnel advancement systems to facilitate the decision-making process, and many of these systems incorporate multiple criteria to improve accurate evaluation of candidates.

Table 1. Vector Definitions
<p>Professional Development: This vector addresses Enlisted rating training. It focuses on a Sailor's ability to acquire job knowledge and skills through such sources as formal schools, correspondence courses and on-the-job training. This is the vector that will show what must be known, and what level of expertise is expected of an individual as a professional in a particular career field. As much as possible, this vector will incorporate industry standards, providing the training and credentials recognized by civilian counterparts.</p>
<p>Personal Development: This vector involves such areas as general military training (GMT) and financial planning and management, as well as college-level courses that allow Sailors to complete degree programs. It focuses on "life skills" needed outside the workplace. Personal Development focuses attention on an individual's development as a person, not just as a Sailor. The notion here is to give Sailors opportunities to develop themselves as people by providing tools for personal growth. Seven clearly defined competency clusters comprise the personal development vector: values, lifelong learning, life skills, financial management skills, health, wellness and recreation, and interpersonal relations.</p>
<p>Leadership: This vector focuses on providing Sailors with the tools and critical thinking skills they will need as leaders. The focus is on developing the ability of an individual to accomplish the mission as well as mentor and develop others. Leadership addresses leadership training, providing the tools and critical thinking skills needed to be effective leaders. It emphasizes the importance of receiving effective leadership training throughout a career, not just at given stages of advancement. Components of the Leadership vector include: communication, professionalism, responsibility/authority/accountability, subordinate development, and leadership awareness.</p>
<p>Certifications and Qualifications: This vector focuses on unit-level requirements and related industry certifications that are directly tied to job proficiencies. It may include industry-recognized standards such as airframe and power plant licenses in the aviation community, Microsoft certifications for those in information technology, and merchant marine qualifications and licenses for deck ratings. For example, an IT would receive a Microsoft Network Certification or a Construction Mechanic might earn an ASE certification after displaying a given level of proficiency within his or her rating.</p>
<p>Performance: This vector assesses an individual's overall job performance. As the Sailor achieves specific milestones, he/she will get promoted -- as long as his/her performance measures up. The Performance vector takes into account all issues related to job performance, including task proficiency and productivity, adaptability, initiative, knowledge and support of unit/command objectives, problem solving and decision making, communication skills and work ethic. It is the measurement of a Sailor's overall on-the-job performance.</p>

For Navy Enlisted Sailors, the current advancement system provides for the orderly progression of qualified personnel to higher levels of responsibility throughout their naval careers. Generally, advancement is based on demonstrated proficiency in assigned duties, on the performance evaluation and recommendation of the commanding officer, and on written examinations.

5VM Advancement

While the current advancement system is operating adequately, it is prudent to speculate on how Navy Enlisted advancement might operate within a 5VM perspective. It is possible to envision development of an *advancement algorithm* that links performance across all five vectors to advancement to the next paygrade. The notion is that an advancement score could be computed based on

achievement of defined milestones across all vectors, as part of the broader plan to define the career paths associated with a member's professional development, personal development, leadership abilities, certifications and qualifications, and overall performance.

This model could then indicate the advancement potential for recruit, apprentice, journeyman, and master skill levels; yielding data to communicate the advancement potential of an individual to both the member and promotion boards. The new scoring system would translate individual performance in these five vectors into an overall ranking, similar to the final multiple produced after today's Navy-wide examinations. Such a system could provide a much more comprehensive and responsive way of looking at who is 'fully qualified,' and identify them as the individuals who should advance.

Study 1: 2003

The first step in developing such a system would be to establish a scientifically sound approach for weighting the contribution of each of the five vectors in making advancement decisions. In 2003 we conducted a research study with that objective in mind. This feasibility study used a *policy capturing* methodology to assist the judgmental processes related to advancement decisions.

A rich literature has developed surrounding the use of a policy-capturing methodology to address how raters use information to make judgments. Policy capturing has been used to examine issues relevant to performance appraisal (e.g., Naylor & Wherry, 1965; Zedeck & Kafry, 1977), individual motivation (e.g., Dachler & Mobley, 1973), job analysis (Sanchez & Levine, 1989), job evaluation (e.g., Madden, 1964), and managerial promotion (Stumpf & London, 1981). A policy capturing approach requires each decision maker to rate a large number of individuals who vary along several criteria. These criteria may be considered predictors of the decision, and the decision maker's policy is inferred through statistical analysis of the ratings.

The feasibility study involved conducting workshops where participants were presented with 5VM profiles, with preset "scores" on the different vectors and asked to rate the promotability of each "profiled Sailor." Analyses of data from these workshops essentially determined the relative weight of each vector in the advancement algorithm. These relative weights were generated for advancement to apprentice, journeyman, and master skill levels.

In 2003, workshops were conducted at Navy sites across the continental United States, to capture the policies of the participants. In all, 89 Sailors participated in the study; 27 Sailors participated in the recruit to apprentice workshops, 32 Sailors participated in the apprentice to journeyman workshops, and 30 Sailors participated in the journeyman to master workshop.

Table 2 presents the results of the feasibility study for Enlisted advancement. As the table indicates, job performance is overall the most important factor, but as rank progresses, within the Enlisted ranks, leadership becomes increasingly important, to a point where performance and leadership are roughly equally important. Professional development is also an important factor, especially early in a Navy career. And, certifications/qualifications have some importance at the lower and middle advancement levels. Finally, personal development was afforded lesser importance for the advancement of Enlisted personnel (for more detailed information see Borman, Hedge, Bruskiewicz, and Bourne, 2003).

Table 2. Relative Weights for Enlisted Personnel Advancement			
Vector	Recruit to Apprentice (Percent)	Apprentice to Journeyman (Percent)	Journeyman to Master (Percent)
Professional Development	17.78	10.62	9.33
Personal Development	1.98	3.47	2.60
Leadership	12.26	31.26	41.23
Certifications/Qualifications	9.99	10.05	6.09
Performance	57.99	44.60	40.75

Objectives of Study 2

While the feasibility study provided a useful roadmap for how advancement might proceed within a Sea Warrior 5VM framework, to realize this Fleet vision of advancement, each of the vectors would need to identify or develop measures of performance that can be employed to measure degrees of success on the vector. When these scoring systems are developed within each vector, overall advancement scores can be computed using the policy capturing results.

In reality, however, presently the performance requirements for most of the five vectors are not sufficiently established, nor are they sufficiently populated with data to proceed with the strategy envisioned in the feasibility study. So, although the feasibility study established that a policy capturing methodology provides a scientifically sound procedure for determining 5VM advancement weights, the study was based on a broad, long-range perspective. The purpose of the current study was to apply a more specific, near-term focus.

In other words, rather than ask the Fleet to speculate on the importance of each of the five vectors in an anticipated, fully developed 5VM, as was the case in the feasibility study, it would also be informative to understand how each of the vectors might be viewed as contributing to a Sailor's "promotability" in today's Navy. In order to do so, the objectives of the present study required new

operational definitions of the five vectors that reflected currently available advancement data organized within a 5VM framework. Once the vectors were re-defined, we could then proceed to apply the policy capturing methodology to determine vector weights across the three skill levels. Such a design would also allow us to compare the results of the preliminary weighting study with those of the current study.

Methodology for Study 2: 2006

Overview

We applied the same methodology briefly discussed in the feasibility study mentioned earlier. This policy capturing methodology refers to a set of procedures used to describe statistically the unique information processing strategies of raters (Bottenberg & Christal, 1961; Christal, 1968).

The policy capturing approach consists of several primary components, including: (a) the presentation to raters of a series of profiles composed of scores on a number of stimulus cues; (b) rater review and rating of each profile of information on some overall criterion which summarizes the information available; and (c) the use of multiple regression analysis within the framework of the general linear model to calculate the extent to which the overall ratings are predictable given the profile scores, and to compute the relative importance or contribution of each of these individual cues in determining the overall ratings.

The statistical equation resulting from the regression analysis is thought to depict the "captured rating policy" for each rater. In other words, the regression equation represents an explicit depiction of the way in which dimensional information is weighted and combined to arrive at an overall promotability rating.

Procedure

In the current study, we applied the policy capturing methodology to gather the perspectives of a cross-section of Navy personnel concerning how accomplishments in each of the five vectors contribute to overall Enlisted promotability. One hundred and twenty profiles were randomly generated to depict varying levels of performance/accomplishment on each of the five vectors. After these profiles were generated, project staff reviewed them to insure all profiles were realistic, and in a small percentage of cases, replaced with new randomly generated profiles (for example, a profile showing a master-level 5VM where performance was a 7 on a 7-point scale and leadership was a 1 was deemed virtually impossible and so was replaced). Each 5VM profile, then, provides summary data regarding accomplishments on each of the 5 vectors. These summary scores were characterized as values on a 7-point scale (1 = low; 7 = high).

During the policy capturing workshops, participants were presented with these 120 mock profiles that represented a snapshot of Sailors' 5VM accomplishments/performance. Different workshops focused on advancement across different skill levels (i.e., recruit to apprentice, apprentice to journeyman, journeyman to master), but the 120 profiles were the same for all workshops.

The task of the participants was to review each profile, consider how that individual's score on all of the individual vectors *together* contribute to an assessment of the Enlisted member's overall promotability, and then rate their overall level of promotability using a 7-point scale. Participants were told that when using the 7-point promotability scale, it might be helpful to apply the following rule-of-thumb:

6-7: outstanding accomplishments; definitely promotable

3-4-5: average level of accomplishment; consider promoting

1-2: below average accomplishments; should not be promoted at this time.

A sample profile is presented below.

Sample Profile								
Vector	Vector Ratings							
	Mean	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Professional Development	5.0	<div><div></div></div>						
Personal Development	5.9	<div><div></div></div>						
Leadership	5.6	<div><div></div></div>						
Certifications/Qualifications	6.2	<div><div></div></div>						
Performance	4.9	<div><div></div></div>						
Overall Promotability for Sample Profile (Please circle your choice): 1 2 3 4 5 6 7								

In addition, to ensure that all raters had a common frame-of-reference regarding what competency components defined each of the five vectors, we provided participants with definitions of the vectors. We also explained to the participants that they should consider the 5VM profile scores to represent summary scores generated from currently available data. Specifically, they were told to assume that professional development, personal development, and leadership scores were produced from advancement examination data (i.e., the content of the test items reflects the concepts contained in the vector definitions). In addition, certification/qualification scores reflected physical fitness assessment (PFA) data, and performance vector scores were produced from past performance evaluation reports.

Recall in the preliminary study, the 5VM was defined in broad conceptual terms and that the objective for the current study was a more narrow focus on currently available data that could be drawn upon to represent each vector. These new vector definitions are provided in Table 3.

Table 3. Vector Definitions
Professional Development: This vector focuses on a Sailor's ability to acquire technical knowledge and skills required to perform duties for a specific rating and paygrade through such sources as formal schools, correspondence courses and on-the-job training. Professional Development includes correspondence courses, warfare designators and command and platform-specific training, such as 3M and QA.
Personal Development: This vector focuses attention on an individual's development as a person, not just as a Sailor. Personal Development includes areas such as personal financial management, health and wellness, and safety/operational risk management (ORM). It also involves educational activities associated with fulfilling higher education degree requirements.
Leadership: This vector focuses on providing Sailors with the tools and critical thinking skills they will need to be effective leaders. Components of the Leadership vector include: communication (e.g., conflict management, watchstanding), professionalism (e.g., military bearing, etiquette), responsibility/authority/accountability (e.g., rules/regulations, military justice), subordinate development (mentoring, Navy benefits), and leadership awareness (principles, Naval heritage).
Certifications and Qualifications: This vector focuses on unit-level requirements and related industry certifications that are directly tied to job proficiencies. The Certifications and Qualifications vector also includes an individual's physical fitness assessment (PFA).
Performance: This vector focuses on an individual's overall job performance. The Performance vector takes into account all issues related to job performance, including task proficiency and productivity, adaptability, initiative, knowledge and support of unit/command objectives, problem solving and decision making, communication skills and work ethic. It is the measurement of a Sailor's overall on-the-job performance.

Data Collection

In order to gather a representative sample of Enlisted personnel from across the U. S. Navy, we conducted workshops at Bremerton, WA – Submarine Group 9 (5 workshops); Millington, TN – Naval Support Activity Mid-South (6 workshops); Norfolk, VA – the USS Eisenhower Strike Group (8 workshops); and Pensacola, FL – Naval Air Station (5 workshops). In all, 24 workshops were conducted to capture the policies of the participants, using the protocol just described.

Separate workshops were conducted for three levels of advancement for Enlisted personnel: recruit to apprentice; apprentice to journeyman; and journeyman to master. To make the task more concrete, we provided participants with representative ranks for each of the three categories. They were recruit to apprentice (E-3 to E-4); apprentice to journeyman (E-5 to E-6); and journeyman to master (E-7 to E-8).

As can be seen in Table 4, 129 E-5 to E-7s rated the 120 recruit-to-apprentice profiles; 128 E-7 to E-9s rated apprentice-to-journeyman profiles, and 61 E-8 to E-9s rated journeyman-to-master 5VM profiles. These senior Enlisted personnel represented aviation, surface, submarine, and shore-based work activities.

Table 4. Demographics for Enlisted Level Workshops

	Recruit-Apprentice		Apprentice-Journeyman		Journeyman-Master	
	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Rate						
E-5	2	1.6	0	0.0	0	0.0
E-6	125	96.7	0	0.0	0	0.0
E-7	2	1.6	99	77.3	0	0.0
E-8	0	0.0	27	21.1	10	16.4
E-9	0	0.0	2	1.6	51	83.6
Work Activity						
Aviation	8		10		4	
Surface Force	55		39		12	
Submarine	27		30		16	
Shore-based	37		30		18	
Other	14		30		17	
Gender						
Male	109	84.5	117	91.4	56	91.8
Female	20	15.5	11	8.6	5	8.2
Ethnic Origin						
American Indian	0	0.0	1	0.8	0	0.0
Asian	4	3.1	0	0.0	1	1.6
Black	33	6.0	27	21.1	7	11.5
Pacific Islander	0	0.0	0	0.0	1	1.6
Spanish/Hispanic	6	4.7	9	7.0	1	1.6
White	84	65.1	87	68.0	51	83.6
Other	2	1.6	4	3.1	0	0.0

Note. Totals may not add to 100 percent due to missing data. Totals for work activities are inflated as a result of some respondents marking more than one current activity; therefore percentages are not computed.

Analyses

Essentially, the policy capturing methodology is a general procedure designed to describe statistically the unique information processing strategies or behaviors of individual raters. Multiple regression analysis is used to calculate the extent to which overall ratings are predictable given scores on separate dimensions or components (in the current situation, vectors), and the relative importance of each component in determining overall ratings (Naylor & Wherry, 1965). Thus, the policy capturing analyses provide estimates of each participant's weights for each of the five vectors.

In the usual policy capturing paradigm, multiple regression is employed as the analysis method. However, multiple regression can only provide importance weights for the independent variables (i.e., vectors) when these variables correlate zero with each other (Darlington, 1968). In the current application, some of the between vector correlations were low but non-zero because of some adjustments made to the scores on the profiles in order to improve 5VM realism. Accordingly, we used a method developed by Johnson (2000) that provides interpretable relative importance weights under conditions of low, non-zero correlations between the independent variables.

These resulting weights can be interpreted as the importance the participant believes should be given to each vector in making advancement decisions at that skill level. The analyses also provided an index of consistency of policy for each participant (R^2 , or variance accounted for), thereby serving as a data screen for raters with inconsistent policies. In general terms, a rater's R^2 value indicates whether the information provided in the 5VM profiles was being used, and used consistently when making promotability ratings. R^2 values range between 0.0 and 1.0, with lower values identifying raters who failed to establish a consistent strategy for using the information to make their ratings. Any rater whose R^2 value fell below .55 was determined to have applied no consistent strategy for how they weighted the five vectors. In all, 29 of the 347 participants were found to be inconsistent in their rating policies, and these cases were dropped from subsequent analyses.

Results

Table 5 presents the pooled, summary results of the policy capturing study for Enlisted advancement. As the table indicates, job performance was the most important factor for advancement from recruit to apprentice level, followed by professional development, leadership, and certifications/qualifications. For advancement from apprentice to journeyman, performance was still the most important factor, but leadership increased considerably in importance, and the weight for professional development decreased, to a point where the importance of leadership and professional development were comparable. Certifications and qualifications still carries some weight, but dropped slightly. Finally, regarding advancement from journeyman to master, participants weighted leadership and performance about equal in importance, with the rest of the vectors accounting for less than 23% of the overall importance weight. Across all skill levels, personal development carries relatively lesser weight.

Table 5. Relative Weights for Enlisted Personnel Advancement

Vector	Recruit to Apprentice (Percent)	Apprentice to Journeyman (Percent)	Journeyman to Master (Percent)
Professional Development	29.68	22.30	15.16
Personal Development	7.65	7.31	4.04
Leadership	16.54	21.66	38.51
Certifications/Qualifications	11.96	10.13	7.62
Performance	34.17	38.60	34.67

A second objective of the present study was to compare the results of the feasibility study to the current study. Table 6 provides a side-by-side comparison of the vector weights for each study. As can be seen, the general pattern of importance weights is quite similar across the two studies. Performance maintains a relatively stable and influential position in the 5VM. Professional development declines across the course of a career, and leadership increases. Certifications and qualifications and personal development play minor roles throughout the career, although certifications and qualifications does carry an importance weight of around 10%.

While patterns of results across the two studies were quite similar, we also examined whether the relative percentages within each of the five vectors were

statistically different across the two studies. Asterisks in Table 6 indicate significant differences. In all, 7 of the 15 comparisons were found to differ across the two studies.

Table 6. Study 1 and Study 2 Relative Weights for Enlisted Personnel Advancement

Vector	Recruit to Apprentice			Apprentice to Journeyman			Journeyman to Master		
	Study 1	Study 2	% change	Study 1	Study 2	% change	Study 1	Study 2	% change
Professional Development	17.78	29.68	-11.90*	10.62	22.30	-11.68*	9.33	15.16	-5.83*
Personal Development	1.98	7.65	-5.67*	3.47	7.31	-3.84*	2.60	4.04	-1.44
Leadership	12.26	16.54	-4.28	31.26	21.66	+9.60*	41.23	38.51	+2.72
Certifications/Qualifications	9.99	11.96	-1.98	10.05	10.13	-0.08	6.09	7.62	+2.72
Performance	57.99	34.17	+23.82*	44.60	38.60	+6.00	40.75	34.67	+6.08

* Denotes significant differences between Study 1 and Study 2 relative percentages, using t-tests for differences between independent samples.

Discussion

The policy capturing research described here provided a scientifically sound approach for pooling the judgment and wisdom of experienced Enlisted personnel regarding the relative weights that should be placed on each of the 5VM vectors in making advancement decisions. This study provided a way for the Fleet to collectively give us their judgment about advancement policy in the U.S. Navy.

The basic finding was that job performance is overall the most important factor, but as skill level progresses, leadership becomes increasingly important, to a point where performance and leadership are roughly equally important. Professional development is also an important factor, especially early in a Navy career, and, certifications/qualifications have some importance at the lower and middle advancement levels. Finally, personal development was afforded lesser importance for the advancement of Enlisted personnel.

While the general pattern of weights in the current study was similar to those in the feasibility study, differences between the two studies were found. Most noteworthy, professional development received higher relative weights across all three skill levels. A second notable difference is the elevated levels for personal development during the second study. Possibly, knowledge that the summary scores for professional and personal development were a product of the advancement exam might have increased the raters' perception of the concrete nature of the vectors, and led to increased weights to some extent. Still, the percentages for the personal development vector were not particularly high relative to the other vectors.

These policy capturing results can form the basis of an advancement algorithm that captures and then operationalizes the Fleet's view of advancement policy within the 5VM. To realize this Fleet vision of advancement, each vector must identify or develop indicators of successful performance, as well as accompanying metrics, to score individuals on the vector with enough granularity to provide variability amongst their peer group. When these scoring systems are developed within each vector, overall advancement scores can be computed using the policy capturing results. Specifically, if a Sailor is, for example, being considered for advancement from apprentice to journeyman, the scores within a vector are weighted by the policy capturing weights. Thus, his/her professional development score is weighted by a factor of 22.30, his/her leadership score by a factor of 21.66, and so on. This approach fully utilizes the individual vectors' scoring systems, but the overall advancement score is computed using the policy weights.

In sum, the policy capturing work provides a framework for advancement algorithms that will reflect the Fleet's conception of what is important for promotion at each level of advancement. Endorsement by policy makers of this advancement approach will allow the Navy to take the next step toward a human resource system that embraces the 5VM philosophy. The specific advancement algorithms and scoring systems are now ready to be built. Once policy has been established, indicators of success and equitable scoring systems within each vector need to be identified or developed. The resulting 5VM advancement system will be merit based, will represent the Fleet's values of individual effectiveness, and will be consistent with the Navy's human resource management strategy.

References

- Borman W. C., Hedge J. W., Bruskiewicz K. T., & Bourne, M. J. (2003). *Initial development work on an objective Navy advancement system linked to the Task Force EXCEL model* (Institute Report #429). Tampa: Personnel Decisions Research Institutes, Inc.
- Bottenberg, R. A., & Christal, R. E. (1961). *An iterative technique for clustering criteria which retains optimum predictive efficiency* (WADD-TN-61-30, AD-261 615). Lackland AFB, TX: Personnel Laboratory, Wright Air Development Division.
- Christal, R. E. (1968). JAN: A technique for analyzing individual and group judgment. *Journal of Experimental Education*, 36, 24-27.
- Dachler, H. P., & Mobley, W. H. (1973). Construct validation of an instrumentality-expectancy-task-goal model of work motivation: Some theoretical boundary conditions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 58, 397-418.
- Darlington, R.B. (1968). Multiple regression in psychological research and practice. *Psychological Bulletin*, 69, 161-182.
- Johnson, J.W. (2000). A heuristic method for estimating the relative weight of predictor variables in multiple regression. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, 35, 1-19.
- Madden, J. M. (1964). An application to job evaluation of a policy-capturing model for analyzing individual and group judgment. *Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 2, 36-42.
- Mullen, M. G. (2006). *CNO guidance for 2006: Meeting the challenge of a new era*. Washington, D. C.: Department of the Navy.
- Naylor, J. C., & Wherry, R. J. (1965). The use of simulated stimuli and the "JAN" technique to capture and cluster the policies of raters. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 25, 969-986.
- Sanchez, J. I., & Levine, E. L. (1989). Determining important tasks within jobs: A policy-capturing approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, 336-342.
- Stumpf, S. A., & London, M. (1981). Capturing rater policies in evaluating candidates for promotion. *Academy of Management Journal*, 24, 752-766.

Zedeck, S., & Kafry, D. (1977). Capturing rater policies for processing evaluation data. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 18, 269-294.